

REMARKS

Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 recites a first component that generates packets including data originating within the first component. Claim 1 was previously amended to recite that the data originating in the component comprises a sequence number.

Claim 1 stands rejected over Chiang (U.S. Pat. Pub 2003/0210652) in view of Raphaeli (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0103521) and Cheng (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2006/0227712). In particular, the Final Office Action mailed 02/28/08 relies on the sequence number of Cheng as providing the recited sequence number originating within the first component. Attorney for Applicant disagrees. In Cheng, the sequence number used by the MAC is received from the RLP layer (paragraph [0064] of Cheng). That is, the sequence number does not originate in the MAC. Thus, Attorney for Applicant disagrees that the proposed combination would yield the subject matter recited by claim 1.

Claim 28 recites a similar limitation. For at least the reasons above, Attorney for Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 28 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. s. 112

Claim 29 stands rejected as being indefinite. Claim 29 recites "a next component directly downstream from the first component in the receive path is to pull the generated packets from a data stream of the receive path". Attorney for Applicant does not understand what is perceived as indefinite. A plain reading of the claim indicates that the next component is to pull the generated packets from the first component. Attorney for Applicant, however, is willing to consider any suggested clarifying amendments.

Attorney for Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the previous claim rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/28/08 _____ /Robert A. Greenberg/
Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778